

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION GOALS AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE
June 17, 2015
SCHOOL BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

Committee Members in Attendance:

Mr. Dan Gecker	Mr. John Hilliard
Ms. Dorothy Jaeckle (for Mr. Elswick)	Mr. Randy Holmes
Ms. Carrie Coyner	Ms. Barbara Mait
Mr. David Wyman (for Ms. Smith)	Mr. Andy Scherzer
Dr. Edgar Wallin	Mr. Chris Sorensen

Member Absent:

Mr. Allan Carmody

Others in Attendance:

Dr. Marcus Newsome
Mr. Jay Stegmaier

Mr. Gecker called the meeting to order at 1 p.m.

A. OPENING REMARKS

There were no opening remarks.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There was no action taken on the agenda.

C. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES/ACTION ITEMS

On motion of Mr. Scherzer, seconded by Ms. Coyner, the minutes of the May 20, 2015 regular meeting were unanimously approved, as submitted.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. PROVIDENCE MIDDLE SCHOOL FINAL DESIGN REVIEW

a. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Mr. Sorensen introduced Mr. John Brooks, new Director of New Construction for CCPS.

Mr. Sorensen then provided an overview of the Providence Middle School project, including the timeline for the project and highlights of the project scope. He provided details of the project scope in the areas of building envelope/systems and site improvements; instructional improvements; and cosmetic improvements.

In response to Mr. Scherzer's questions, Mr. Stephen Halsey with Moseley Architects stated changes made during the process dealt mainly with accessibility, ADA compliance and

improvements to the gym. He further stated at one point there was a larger two-story infill addition and a closed-off courtyard, but as the space within the building was fine-tuned, both locker rooms were able to be placed where the existing girls locker room is located and it was determined that the two-story infill addition was not needed. He stated, in addition to cost savings, this would also maintain some of the charm of the existing school, which has a lot of natural light, while still being able to address security issues. He further stated the courtyard is being reconfigured and a corner room is being dedicated for community space after hours.

In response to Mr. Holmes' question, Mr. Halsey stated the existing building is approximately 129,000 square feet and approximately 4,500 square feet is being added.

In response to Mr. Scherzer's question regarding site plans, Mr. Halsey stated the architects should be ready to begin the site plan review process within two to four weeks.

There was brief discussion relative to access to and usability of the after-hours community space.

Dr. Wallin expressed concerns relative to parking issues at Providence Middle School and inquired whether anything is being done to address this. He suggested that signage or marking be done to give the bus loop an appearance of a parking area after-hours.

Mr. Halsey stated approximately 24 parking spaces are being provided to go along with the new front drop-off.

Mr. Hilliard referenced the vandalism that occurred at the school over the weekend and inquired whether that created any problems with the proposed project.

Mr. Halsey stated some of the interior windows and doorframes that were damaged were already scheduled to be replaced as part of the project. He further stated he does not think the vandalism would impact anything with the proposed project.

Mr. Gecker inquired about the purpose of the closed session.

Mr. Sorensen stated the Virginia Procurement Act does not allow open examination of cost estimates. He further stated the budget for this project has been out for some time, but there is now a cost estimate based on architectural drawings, and discussing it in open session might impact the procurement process.

Mr. Gecker stated it would be helpful to know where we are in terms of a cost estimate for the project.

b. CLOSED SESSION

On motion of Mr. Holmes, seconded by Mr. Hilliard, the committee unanimously voted to go into closed session in accordance with Section 2.2-3711.A of the Code of Virginia, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and specifically under subsection 29, to discuss the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds, including interviews of bidders or offerors, and discuss the terms or scope of such contract, where discussion in an open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.

On motion of Mr. Scherzer, seconded by Dr. Wallin, the committee reconvened to open session.

On motion of Ms. Coyner, seconded by Ms. Mait, the following resolution was adopted by the committee:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from opening meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the committee.

Mr. Gecker: Aye.
Ms. Jaeckle: Aye.
Ms. Coyner: Aye.
Mr. Wyman: Aye.
Dr. Wallin: Aye.
Mr. Hilliard: Aye.
Mr. Holmes: Aye.
Ms. Mait: Aye.
Mr. Scherzer: Aye.
Mr. Sorensen: Aye.

Mr. Gecker opened the floor for discussion.

Mr. Scherzer stated it would have been helpful to have site plans for the project ahead of time to see how it interacts with the community, and committee members could have forwarded their questions to staff prior to the meeting.

Ms. Jaeckle referenced the notes from the Manchester Middle School community meeting and stated it would have been helpful to have the notes that were taken at the Providence Middle School community meeting before taking action related to this project.

Mr. Gecker stated as we go forward, it would be helpful to have the Department of Education's (DOE) reviews of projects, as well as their standards. He further stated he thought one of goals was to provide the same instructional opportunities and if you look at the newer middle schools, he still does not have that understanding of what is put into those schools that may or may not be able to put into the rehabilitation. He inquired whether Schools has a separate set of standards from DOE for construction of middle schools.

Mr. Halsey stated many years ago, DOE relaxed their standards and they are just recommendations now. He further stated the formal submission of school project documents stopped a while ago, so their documentation is now used as a guideline. He stated this allows the architects to work with the central office and instructional experts to tailor DOE's recommendations to the school system's needs. He further stated several meetings have been held with department heads at the school, as well as central office staff, to really understand instructional needs related to the project.

Mr. Gecker stated having some understanding of the input that was provided to Mr. Halsey would have been helpful. He inquired about the instructional criteria that went into the design of Tomahawk Middle School and how we would be able to accomplish those goals in the rehab projects. He stated there should be a list of what is needed as a standard for instruction throughout the county – number of classrooms, square footage of classrooms, laboratory capability, etc.

Dr. Wallin stated there should be specifications for the new middle school, and the committee should be provided with that information, as well as a template to easily compare information such as the number of classrooms, etc., for each of the projects. He further stated the specifications that were written for Matoaca High School could be easily applied to renovation of high schools.

Mr. Halsey stated technical specifications would be easy to compare and they may be available from the most recently constructed middle schools. In terms of instructional specifications, he stated the educational methodology that went into the past two middle schools is outdated due to the implementation of Chromebooks and one-to-one technology. He stated those schools were designed with boxes and classrooms and more traditional spaces, but with the implementation of Chromebooks at the middle school level, both the Providence and Manchester projects will have more flexible spaces and small breakout spaces that will perform a different function than spaces at Tomahawk Middle School. He further stated while we do have a good understanding of what was implemented at Tomahawk and past projects, they are only relevant to a certain point because they were based on a 1,500-student middle school program that was developed almost 20 years ago.

Mr. Roger Richardson, architect with Moseley Architects, stated the current standard at DOE level is a recommendation or a guideline, which was developed as a result of a committee combining a number of educational school divisions in the metropolitan area and beyond, as well as a number of architects who have practiced in the area of public K-12. He further stated, previously, the architect would submit preliminary designs to DOE for review and approval, but that requirement has been eliminated. He stated the architect is required to submit final documents as a matter of record to DOE, which are evaluated using the current guidelines, such as classroom size, number of shelves, book counts, etc. based on K-5, 6-8 or 9-12 alignment. He further stated all of those things are considered during the design process and noted that much has changed since Tomahawk and Elizabeth Davis Middle Schools were opened. He stated when you add in the new standards for STEM, teaming, independent study, learning skills as opposed to curriculum-based educational specifications, that demands a change in the building.

Mr. Gecker suggested taking the opportunity of Providence Middle School to prepare new standards for middle schools.

Ms. Coyner stated that is what the instructional staff did when they met with the architects and designed the Providence building.

Mr. Gecker inquired whether there is a document somewhere in the school division that has these new construction specifications for a middle school in the county, based on the Providence project.

Mr. Halsey stated that is something that might happen beyond the design team.

Mr. Gecker stated he is looking at the school division for this, rather than the design team.

Dr. Wallin inquired how the building could be designed without instructional specifications.

Mr. Halsey stated it was important for the architects to sit down with instructional folks to determine other instructional changes that might be coming in the future.

Mr. Wyman stated this is probably a task that school administration needs to undertake by taking the information that was discussed and placing it into a standard form that can be applied to the next school projects.

Dr. Wallin stated another issue is providing worthy information for both this committee and the public. He further stated we will never have the same school in every location, so without some baseline information and comparative data, we will never be able to create some type of parity. He stated it should not be difficult to take the best and most current middle schools and create a template, with two columns to provide a visual image of what is being done and how one project compares to another.

Mr. John Brooks stated we are in a period of transition from 1,500 to 1,100-student capacity. He further stated it is a reasonable expectation that the document that has been discussed will be delivered.

E. OLD BUSINESS

1. MANCHESTER MIDDLE SCHOOL PROJECT AREA REVIEW

Mr. Roger Richardson stated this project began in July 2014 and since that time, there have been a number of benchmarking trips in an effort to help visualize how buildings are responding to an evolving education program and trying to meet new demands. He further stated he would not categorize Tomahawk and Elizabeth Davis as out-of-date, although they were designed under a different period of time. He stated schools must be more agile today just to accommodate changes as they are rapidly occurring, noting that we are trying to create educational environments that support skills more so than seat time. He stated the Manchester site plan, as it exists today, evolved over 50 years. He stated considerations with the Manchester renovation project include physical limitations of the existing site; urban development; partnering efforts for revitalization improvements; and access across the site. He further stated the existing building has 166,000 square feet, not including the 22 modular units that will be taken away, upon completion. He stated the focus will be on revitalization of the existing plan, reinforcement of circulation internally, and reorganization of space to provide adjacencies between public space and the private side of the building where the students spend the majority of their time, which will add to manageability of the facility, as well as security and safety issues. He noted that the building opened in 1963 as a high school and provided details of the current parking situation at the building. He stated the current classroom size is 625-630 square feet, based on the DOE standards at the time the building was opened, and the current guideline is 700 square feet; therefore, the architect will be structurally intervening to reorganize space inside the building to make those spaces what they should be to accommodate current middle school standards. He further stated the project will address site circulation issues; access issues; community presence; lack of landscaping; technology; overcrowding; and pupil-teacher ratio. He noted that Tomhawk

and Elizabeth Davis were set up to accommodate approximately 129 square feet per student, and Manchester will be set up to accommodate 140 square feet per student, using the facility as it exists and accommodating the collaborative areas that are not necessarily assigned for instruction, such as the commons area. He provided details of some of the current conditions at the school and stated the 1980s library will be replaced and organized in a way that it fits within the circulation of the building and will be an active environment rather than a quiet environment. He stated the locker spaces will be redone entirely; the auditorium will be refinished; and every area of the building will be affected to accommodate accessibility to people with physical needs. He further stated the new configuration will eliminate the intermediate level of the auditorium; the mechanical equipment will be concealed to present a better image; the front door will be re-defined; and additional square footage to accommodate administrative space will provide a more secure entry and a much greater identity. He stated the mechanical and electrical systems and lighting will be replaced and a fire suppression system will be added to the building. He further stated the core curriculum, including IDP, STEM and Center-Based Gifted programs will be accommodated as appropriate. He stated furniture will play a major role to make classrooms more agile and flexible and more team-based and collaborative, and connectivity will be provided to the outside to take advantage of courtyards and to create vegetation areas. In terms of revitalization, he stated the major focus will be reconnecting to the street and making it a true greenspace. He stated space will be created for community access and placed in locations closer to the front door. He stated the design process is underway and he anticipates that several options for revitalization and redesigning the space will be presented to the user group at the school and to school administration within the next 10 days. He further stated once that is refined into something that they are ready to commit to, the architect will move forward rapidly to complete of the schematic design process. He provided details of the project schedule and noted that an additional community meeting will be scheduled.

Discussion ensued relative to after-hours use of the facility by the community.

Mr. Carl Schlaudt provided a brief overview of companion projects that are being discussed for the Manchester Middle School revitalization, including transportation improvements, park site improvements and implementing the neighborhood enhancement (property maintenance) program in six neighborhoods with approximately 800 homes.

Ms. Coyner referenced two middle schools in the city that were renovated and noted that one of the schools is still not performing, but the other school is now experiencing high performance due to community revitalization efforts around it, getting investment back into the community and getting businesses to return, thus helping to change the lives of the residents in the community. She inquired what the county was looking at in terms of coordination and whether the Revitalization Committee was still meeting.

Mr. Schlaudt stated the committee still exists in a reduced form – it is now called the Revitalization Strategy Committee (a staff level committee) and meets twice a month. He stated the ideas that were presented at the Manchester community meeting came from this committee and its conversations with school representatives. He noted that the county is in the process of hiring a Revitalization Manager.

In response to Ms. Coyner's question regarding opportunities, Mr. Schlaudt stated Economic Development is represented on the committee, and there are incentives for businesses to locate in the technology zone within the Manchester Middle School revitalization target area.

Ms. Coyner stated the revitalization efforts are very important, and she would like to see what the Revitalization Strategy Committee is focusing on.

In response to Mr. Stegmaier's question, Ms. Coyner stated the two city schools she referenced were Martin Luther King, Jr. and Thompson middle schools. She noted that Planning staff would have a presentation regarding the two schools on Friday, June 19. She stated she would forward the information to Mr. Stegmaier.

2. SCHOOL REFERENDUM PROJECT DURATION

Mr. Matt Harris stated the school bond referendum was originally looked at as a 7-year program when it was prepared with the meals tax, but when the meals tax was not approved, it fell to approximately an 11-year window. He further stated CCPS staff worked to condense that back down to where it sits today as a 9-year implementation window, and staff has looked over time at the feasibility of getting back to the original 7-year window and will continue to look at that. He stated staff felt this was a plausible path, with the debt service with the recently adopted CIPs and where we would need to be in 7 years with a maximum difference in the \$3.5 million range. In light of the Monacan High School bid, he stated it may be a little premature to move to a 7-year window, indicating that staff will be taking a look at the budgets for the other projects as part of the FY17 CIP/budget process to make sure they are refined with what we know today, and use that information and feedback for modeling on the debt service side.

In response to Ms. Jaeckle's question related to construction escalators, Mr. Harris stated, based on what we know today, the difference in cost between a 9-year program and a 7-year program would be approximately \$3.5 million in debt service annually for a couple of years before decreasing as other issuances are completed. He further stated that does not take into account what the next round of revitalization projects might be. He noted there are still key pieces of information needed before determining whether the program can move from 9 years to 7 years.

Dr. Wallin stated it is a little more complicated than just saying 7 versus 9 years. He further stated there are multiple elementary schools to be developed and inquired whether the school division would be contracting with the architect for one school and then building all four schools. He noted that there is a sense of urgency to make some of these decisions and it would be worthy of discussing these issues in the long run because he knows there can be some savings.

Mr. Holmes stated construction escalation is one variable that no one can predict, and that will make a difference in the 7-year versus 9-year program.

Mr. Wyman stated the School Board has already talked about the possibility of contracting out for the elementary schools perhaps in a separate way than what is being done with the other projects.

In response to Mr. Scherzer's question, Mr. Wyman stated the PPEA process is still a funding option.

Dr. Wallin stated another issue is the type of expertise in management that is available for the project. He further stated it might be good to have a presentation regarding providing in-house management, or a combination of in-house and private industry management. He stated it would

be good to have this discussion to convey to the public how the projects are going to be managed.

Ms. Jaeckle stated she would like to see data related to the cost difference between 9 and 7 years, and if it is not that much of a difference, then should we consider 7 versus 9.

Further discussion ensued relative to the school bond referendum moving from 9 to 7 years.

F. NEXT MEETING AGENDA TOPICS

Mr. Gecker noted that the topic the committee did not get to today (Architectural/Engineering Firm Selection Process) will be included on the next agenda.

G. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Gecker adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m. until August 19, 2015, at 1 p.m.